



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,419	03/18/2004	Daniel D. Friel SR.	FRIEL-105	5873
7590	09/26/2005		EXAMINER	
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP P.O. Box 2207 Wilmington, DE 19899-2207				SHAKERI, HADI
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3723

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SJP

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/803,419	FRIEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hadi Shakeri	3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 63-86 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 81 and 82 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 63-80 and 83-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/11/05 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 63-79 and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 63, the language, i.e., line 12, "non-extended shape" renders the claims indefinite. It is unclear what is being claimed with a non-extended shape, any three dimensional shape will have a thickness, a length and a width, which would be an "extended" shape.

Same rejection applies to claim 83.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3723

5. Claims 63-79 and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edling (4,285,253) in view of Leong (2,461,690) and/or Leong in view of Edling.

Edling meets all of the limitations of claim 63 and 83, i.e., achieving a fine smooth finish by a non-grinding means of utilizing a harden object, except for disclosing a non-motor-driven object. However, Edling discloses a superior finish by using a steel, whether manual or mechanical (05:57-60) and discloses a preferred embodiment of mechanical means.

Leong teaches sharpening a knife by manual means. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Edling by using a manual means as taught by Leong, e.g., to save cost.

Regarding claims 64-79 and 83-86, Edling as modified by Leong meets all of the limitations, e.g., elongated flat surface (Edling, 34); stationary object (not movable); rotatable cylinder; braking mechanism (threaded connection) which is considered to meet the limitation of adjustable object (claim 70), however further modifying the invention for adjustability is well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art; grooved surface; Rockwell C-65; rods or rollers; handle; and hardened object made of glass or crystal is considered to meet the limitation of claims 78 and 86, however, choosing a surface roughness of less than 10 microns would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, dependent on work-piece/operational parameters, which involves only routine skill in the art, and since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Leong discloses a sharpening apparatus and method meeting all of the limitations of claims 63 and 83, except for disclosing a harden object. Edling teaches achieving a fine smooth finish by a non-grinding means of utilizing a harden object. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Leong by using a harden object as taught by Edling, e.g., for a superior finish.

Regarding claims 64-79 and 83-86, Leong as modified by Edling meets all of the limitations as noted above.

6. Claims 63-68, 70-75, 77-79 and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friel (Des. 368,217) in view of Edling.

Friel meets all of the limitations of claim 63 and 83, i.e., knife-edge enhancing or conditioning apparatus and method having a precision angle knife guide, except for disclosing a hardened object for the sharpening tool.

Edling teaches achieving a fine smooth finish by a non-grinding means of utilizing a harden object. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the invention of Friel by substituting the sharpener with a harden object as taught by Edling to obtain a fine smooth finish.

Regarding claims 64-68, 70-75, 77-79 and 84-86, Friel as modified by Edling meets the limitations, as noted above and in previous office actions.

7. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PA (prior art, Friel modified by Edling) as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Fletcher (4,450,653).

Friel modified by Edling meets all of the limitations of claim 69, i.e., except rotatable harden object with braking mechanism.

Fletcher teaches setting the harden object into a support by threaded means. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to

further modify the modified invention of PA by using a threaded connection between the object and the support as taught by Fletcher for an adjustable object.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 81 and 82 are allowed.
9. Claims 79 and 80 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: a restraining mechanism (O-ring 20) applying a resistive force, i.e., the object being displaceable (as defined by Specification, not met by rotation of the object); inverted U shaped spring as recited in claim 80, and knife guide being pivotally mounted in a support member with an adjusting structure (Fig. 16A) as recited in claim 50, place these claims in condition for allowance.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 08/11/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues against the obviousness rejections by the Declaration filed on 08/11/05 that "conditioning" technique is different than the common sharpening techniques, modification would require undue experimentation, and the commercial success.

With regards to conditioning vs. sharpening, Edling is concerned with fine finish after sharpening a blade (01:1-11). It discloses that sharpening methods of grinding the blade is used to achieve rough finish and such methods are desirable for removing metal, e.g., in the case of chipped, seriously dulled...and teaches non-grinding means of fine finish by steeling meeting "conditioning technique" as defined by the instant application. Mr. Friel 's declaration in paragraph 9, defines steeling as method to straighten the burr created by abrasive sharpening

Art Unit: 3723

and to align the burr, and that the harden surface is made with no abrasives. This fails to distinguish "steeling" as defined by the declaration not to read over the claims as recited, e.g., harden surface being substantially free of abrasives.

With regards to undue experimentations, the point is moot in view of new grounds of rejections and with regards to modification of Friel and Edling, the declaration that modifying a sharpening apparatus as disclosed by Friel, to a "conditioning apparatus" in view of Edling, for a fine finish for blades already sharpened, requires undue experimentations is not persuasive. The argument regarding undue experimentations in the declaration is with respect to the invention as disclosed and it is not persuasive to the invention as claimed.

The argument regards to commercial success also fails to read over the rejection over Friel in view of Edling to the claims as recited.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hadi Shakeri whose telephone number is 571-272-4495. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Hadi Shakeri  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3723  
September 22, 2005